

## REMARKS

Claims 1 and 4-6 were examined. Claim 1 is amended. Claims 1 and 4-6 remain in the Application.

The Patent Office rejects claims 1 and 4-6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested in view of the above amendment and the following remarks.

### **A. After Final Amendment**

Applicant amends claim 1 to clarify that the apparatus comprises a plurality of circuit substrates on a substrate and the plurality of circuit substrates are in a non-planar orientation relative to one another. The amendment clarifies that the plurality of circuit substrates are in a non-planar orientation relative to one another, rather than possibly an interpretation that the plurality of circuit substrates and the substrate on which they are formed are in a non-planar orientation. The claim amendment is fully supported by the Application (see **Figure 6** and the accompanying text) and Applicant respectfully requests that the Patent Office enter the amendment.

### **B. 35 U.S.C § 103(a): Rejection of Claims 1 & 4-6**

The Patent Office rejects claims 1 and 4-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over U.S. Patent Number 5,591,678 of Bendik, et al. (Bendik) in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,248,646 of Okojie (Okojie). According to the Patent Office Bendik discloses in **Figure 1** an apparatus comprising a circuit substrate including a single semiconductor having a smallest dimension reduced with circuit devices formed in the single crystal layer. Okojie is cited for disclosing a plurality of circuit substrates on a substrate and in a non-planar orientation relative to one another.

Independent claim 1 is not obvious over the cited references because the cited references do not describe an apparatus including a plurality of circuit substrates on a substrate and the plurality of circuit substrates are in a non-planar orientation relative to one another. With regard

to the non-planar orientation, the Patent Office relies on Okojie which shows small wafers 24 in a non-planar orientation relative to large wafer 20, not relative to one another.

For the above stated reason, independent claim 1 is not obvious over the cited references. Claims 4-6 depend from claim 1 and therefore contain all the limitations of that claim. For at least the reason stated with respect to claim 1, claims 4-6 are not obvious over the cited references.

Applicant respectfully requests the Patent Office withdraw the rejection to claims 1 and 4-6.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all claims now pending patentably define the subject invention over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 11/4/05

William T. Babbitt  
William Thomas Babbitt, Reg. No. 39,591

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90025  
(310) 207-3800

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1480, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Amber D. Saunders 11/4/05  
Amber D. Saunders Date